



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

to judge him by his ineptitudes and pedantries. For utterances of neither kind is Dionysius alone responsible. He is in a peculiar degree the representative of a time and a guild. The futilities of Dionysius are probably on the whole better known than his excellences, and we may therefore pardon the editor for having in large measure ignored them. But they remain nevertheless, and one must wonder that they did not give pause to Professor Roberts' enthusiastic proclamation of his critical merits. Dionysius possessed a receptive mind and a graceful but garrulous pen. He was a perfect product of that new rhetoric to which (like Cicero) he gives the fair name of "political philosophy." He was well read in a large mass of rhetorical and aesthetical criticism and, for his immediate purpose in this work, had turned over a good deal of more technical matter relating to the aesthetics of sound in music and in verse. He has preserved for us priceless material, and it is not easy to say what is his own and what he has derived from his betters. But side by side with so much that is admirable are to be found such fatuity, such unhistorical scholasticism, such *naïveté* as must place him in a class far below his nearest contemporaries in the same field of writing, Cicero, Horace, and the writer *On the Sublime*.

G. L. HENDRICKSON

The Universities of Ancient Greece. By JOHN W. H. WALDEN.
New York: Scribner, 1909. Pp. 367.

Mr. Walden's *Universities of Ancient Greece* is a very readable book. It sets forth a most interesting subject in a very clear and, for the most part, graceful style, and ought, therefore, to appeal to the larger reading public for which it is partly intended. It will be useful also to the narrower circle of Greek students as a reliable handbook well provided with references to sources and rather copious footnotes.

The first part of the book, extending through four disappointingly brief chapters, sketches, by way of introduction, the history of education, especially of higher education, in Greece in the Athenian and Macedonian periods. The author then proceeds to his main subject, "University" education in Greece under the Roman emperors, which he develops under these captions: "Establishment of University Education in Grecian Lands"; "History of University Education from Marcus Aurelius to Constantine"; "The Decline of University Education"; "The Conflict with Christianity"; "The Professors: Their Appointment and Number"; "The Professors: Their Pay and Position in Society"; "What the Sophists Taught and How They Taught It"; "Public Displays"; "School Houses, Holidays, etc."; "The School at Antioch"; "The Boyhood of a Sophist"; "Student Days"; "After College."

Higher education received its greatest encouragement under the

imperial "foundations for the advancement of teaching" in the second century of our era. Antoninus Pius set the example of granting to those who entered the learned professions immunity from the most burdensome of public duties such as taxes and military service, and of giving to all cities in the Empire the privilege of establishing a number of public lectureships, supported from the civic treasuries, in literature, philosophy, and sophistic. The freedom from public burdens thus insured, the very substantial prizes in the way of well-salaried "chairs," and the enviable social prestige of the "professors," who sometimes bore themselves as "demi-gods among demi-asses," operated as allurements with more than the desired effect. They attracted the ablest and most brilliant minds in Greece but, unfortunately, also stimulated into quick growth a rank crop of the spurious long-beards so delightfully caricatured in Lucian's laughing satire.

Nevertheless, these grants were, with an occasional exception, continued by the later emperors, some of whom took a very particular interest in higher education. Marcus Aurelius occupied himself especially in an attempt to revive the ancient glory of Pericles' "School of Greece" and make the "University" at Athens the intellectual center of the Empire. To this end he established in addition to the lectureships already existing there a chair of sophistic and one chair in each of the four recognized branches of philosophy, supporting them directly from the imperial treasury.

For a time Athens was what Marcus Aurelius desired her to be. Gradually, however, the most brilliant "professors" were drawn to the large centers of wealth and population, such as Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch. But no irony of fortune could take from Athens the magic of her name, the spell wrought by the memory of her one-time intellectual supremacy; and even in the later Empire when the city had sunk to the level of a poor and insignificant village, when her treasures of art had been stripped from her to adorn the eastern capital, when her schools had only the prestige of ancient associations, she was still in the minds of cultivated men "Golden Athens," the "Eye of Greece," her "brightest star," and no education was regarded as complete without a visit there and the inspiration which came from walking on this sacred ground and breathing this sacred air.

Higher education in Greece presents quite as many contrasts as parallels to modern university education, and it may be doubted whether the free use in this book of such words as "university" and "professor," with their definite modern connotations, for vague analogues in antiquity will be more illuminating than confusing to the average reader. The old Greek "university," it appears, was made up of a number of chairs or lectureships supported by public funds of the city or, in rare cases, of the Empire; generally at least two chairs in sophistic, at least one

chair in philosophy (neo-Platonism was everything in the later Empire), and one in literature ("grammar"). The incumbents were not usually organized into a faculty, each supplementing the others, and all co-operating to give a co-ordinated course of instruction; on the contrary, they were, for the most part, not only independent of each other but often in bitter and undignified rivalry, each "professor" being a school in himself with his own devoted and partisan following.

In this strenuous competition and scramble for numbers philosophy seems never to have had much of a chance. Sophistic gave a more practical training for getting on in life and gradually crowded other subjects to the wall until it too in its turn had to give way to still more practical and more up-to-date subjects like Latin, law, and shorthand!

The author gives us a very vivid picture of what the sophistic training was and what were its aims and great pretensions. We regret that something corresponding to this is not done for philosophy. Indeed, the one serious criticism which can be made of this book is that nowhere in it does the author adequately emphasize the nature and the cause of the old quarrel between philosophy and sophistic. In his desire to prove that under the superficiality and emphasis on outward show of the sophistic teaching there was in many cases a sound basis of training which fitted admirably for the life of the times, he has not given enough attention to other sides of his subject, and as a result his book, however excellent in other respects, is somewhat lacking in balance.

GEORGE NORLIN

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO

Grundriss der Geschichte der klassischen Philologie. Von
ALFRED GUDEMAN. Zweite, vermehrte Auflage. Leipzig:
B. G. Teubner, 1909. 8vo, pp. vi+260. M. 5.

One's first thought on taking up this second edition of Gudeman's useful *Grundriss*, which hardly more than two years after the appearance of the first edition is increased from 224 to 260 pages, is one of envy and of impatience with our American habit of stereotyping, which would make such a revision ruinously expensive. The additions consist of brief characterizations of the different epochs into which the author divides the history of classical studies, and a fuller explanation of the names applied to manuscripts, presented in a brief introduction to that topic and in numerous footnotes.

Unfortunately the fundamental defect of the book, which was pointed out by Professor Morgan in his review of the first edition (*Class. Phil.* IV [1909], 90) remains uncorrected. Why should the suggestions of G. Wissowa and E. Norden be adopted, and the much more essential and vital one made by M. Morgan be ignored? One would suppose that even